UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/546,682	04/11/2000	Shinya Goto	35.C14417	4688

5514   7590   05/29/2003

FITZPATRICK CELLA HARPER & SCINTO
30 ROCKEFELLER PLAZA
NEW YORK, NY 10112

EXAMINER
SAJOUS, WESNER

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2676	6

DATE MAILED: 05/29/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 07-01)

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _28 April 2003_ .

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _1-10 and 19-22_ is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) _1-4 and 7-20_ is/are rejected.

7)☒ Claim(s) _5 and 6_ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

    If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

        1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

        2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

        3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

    a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ .

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: .

DETAILED ACTION

Remark

This communication is responsive to the amendment and response filed on April 28, 2003. By this communication, claims 11-16 are canceled without disclaimer. As a result, claims 1-10, and 19-22 are currently pending, of which claims 1-10, 19, and 20 are amended.

Response to Arguments

1.   Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-10, and 11-20 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2.   The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3.   Claim 22 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

4.   Claim 22 recites the limitation "analyzing the plurality of character encoding schemes..." in 3. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim, for a plurality of character encoding schemes has not been defined in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

6.   Claims 1-4, 7-10, 11-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Kanungo et al., (hereinafter kanungo), Pat. No. 5870084 in view of

Cobbley et al. (5546538), hereinafter Cobbley.

Considering claim 1, Kanungo discloses a character-string information output

apparatus for outputting character string information supported by a predetermined

character encoding scheme (see abstract and figs. 3-14), comprising:

search means for searching the character-string information having identical contents

(e.g., *by means of a harsh table 160 of figs. 10-12 running under application program 64*

of fig. 5 for indexing glyph information related Unicode characters for languages with a

large number of characters, see col. 15, line 7 to col. 11, line 45) and supported by a

plurality of character-encoding schemes (e.g., *a plurality of code points or encoding*

values, see col. 15, lines 45-55), when output of the character string information is

instructed (e.g., *via items 92 and 95 of figs. 6 or 9, see col. 14, lines 37-56)*;

extraction means (e.g., items 70 and 74 of fig. 5) for extracting the character encoding

scheme interpretable by the character-string information output apparatus (e.g., *by*

means of interpreter 74 and rendering engine 92, fig. 5) from the character encoding

schemes supporting the character-string information searched by the search means

(160 of fig. 10); and character-string information outputting means (*e.g., items 74 and*

92, fig. 5) for outputting the character-string information supported by the extracted

character encoding scheme. The applicant should note that the hash table 160 and

encoding engine 84 that is coupled to the rendering engine 92 are of the components of

interpreter 74, which operates in conjunction with application program 64, for detecting

for large number of characters (i.e., characters of similar contents) from the multi-

language characters of a same string for use by the encoding engine to invoke a proper

rendering engine corresponding to the language of each character for display. See

abstract and columns 7-16.

It is noted that Kanungo fails to teach that the search character-string information is

from an external memory.

Cobbley in a similar art teaches searching character information from an

external memory. See col. 4, lines 14-40.

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the

time the invention was made to modify the hash table 160 of interpreter 74, fig. 6, of

Kanungo to include the search of character-string information from an external memory.

The modification would have been for the purpose of searching and identifying

characters of the same characteristics in a text, and to improve in performing accurate

handwriting recognition in portable computer devices. See Cobbley's col. 4, lines 14-

40.

Regarding claim 2, Kanungo discloses a character-string information output comprising font information search means (150 and 160, see col. 15, lines 7-15) for searching font information corresponding to the character string information supported by the extracted character encoding scheme, wherein said character-string information output means (92/95) outputs the character string information based on the searched font information (*as characterized by the illustrations at figs. 113-14*).

As per claim 3, Kanungo discloses the equivalence for a character string information output means (92/95) outputs character string information supported by the character encoding scheme capable of responding to only a limited language (e.g., characters for languages with large characters, i.e., Japanese or Chinese, see col. 15, lines 10-15)   and the character-string information supported by the character encoding scheme capable of responding to a plurality of languages (see abstract and cols. 1-4, and 15).

Re claim 4, the claimed--character-string information output apparatus the character string information output means automatically selects the character encoding scheme extracted by the extraction means and outputs (via rendering engine 92) the character-string supported by the selected character encoding scheme (e.g., the encoding scheme represented by one of encoding values 174a-174n of fig. 10).

Regarding claim 7, Kanungo discloses a character-string information output system (*figs. 1-14*) provided with a character-string information recording apparatus (*30, 34, 40/74 and 150/160 {harsh table figs. 10-11} corresponding to devices 62 and 64)*

and a character-string information output apparatus (18), wherein said character-string

information recording apparatus comprises:

analyzing means (*64, and 40/74 using applications program stored in table 150/160*

and/or from devices 30/34) for analyzing a plurality of character encoding schemes (see

fig. 12-14) supporting character-string information having contents identical with

contents of inputted character-string information; and recording means (e.g., item 18 of

fig. 2, by means of the operations *performed by the data structures illustrated at figs. 10*

and 11 under the commands executed under resource file 62 and application program

64 and devices 40/74. It is noted that the illustrations provided at figs. 10-11 including

harsh tables 150 and 160 corresponding with resource file 62 and application program

64 intrinsically include software libraries which are applied to cause the character-string

of large characters to be provided to computer/set-top box 18 to processed and

recorded or stored, as would be apparent to one skilled in the art considering the

embodiments of Kanungo. See cols. 8-10) The character-string information output

apparatus (18) comprises a search means (74/160) for searching the character string

information having identical contents and supported by the plurality of character

encoding schemes(e.g., *a plurality of code points or encoding values, see col. 15, lines*

45-55), when output of the character string information is instructed (*e.g., via items 92*

and 95 of figs. 6 or 9, see col. 14, lines 37-56);

extraction means (e.g., items 70 and 74 of fig. 5) for extracting the character encoding

scheme interpretable by the character-string information output apparatus (*e.g., by*

means of interpreter 74 and rendering engine 92, fig. 5) from the character encoding

schemes supporting the character-string information searched by the search means (160 of fig. 10); and character-string information outputting means (*e.g., items 74 and 92, fig. 5*) for outputting the character-string information supported by the extracted character encoding scheme. See abstract and columns 7-16.

It is noted that Kanungo fails to teach that the search character-string information is from an external memory.

Cobbley in a similar art teaches searching character information from an external memory. See col. 4, lines 14-40.

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the hash table 160 of interpreter 74, fig. 6, of Kanungo to include the search of character-string information from an external memory. The modification would have been for the purpose of searching and identifying characters of the same characteristics in a text, and to improve in performing accurate handwriting recognition in portable computer devices. See Cobbley's col. 4, lines 14-40.

The invention of claims 8-10 recite the underlying features and steps performed the method of claims 1 and 7. As the various elements of claims 1 and 7 have been shown to be met by the combined teachings Kanungo and Cobbley, it is readily apparent that the method disclosed by the applied prior art (using a computer readable program, fig. 2) performs the recited underlying functions. As such the limitations recited in claims 8-10 are rejected by the same rationale given above for claims 1, and 7.

The invention of claims 19 and 20 recite the underlying features and steps

capable of performing the method of claim 1. As the various elements of claim 1 have

been met by the combined teachings of Kanungo and Cobbley, it is readily apparent

that the method disclosed by the applied prior art (using a computer readable program,

fig. 2) performs the recited underlying functions. As such the limitations recited in

claims 19 and 20 are rejected by the same rationale given above for claim 1.

As per claims 21 and 22, it is noted that the limitations and steps recited by the

claims are included in and performed by the method and system of claims 8 and 9. As

such, the inventions of claims 21 and 22 are rejected under the same rationale set forth

for claims 8 and 9.

Allowable Subject Matter

7.   Claims 5-6 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but

would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the

base claim and any intervening claims, because the prior art fail to suggest a

character-string information output apparatus wherein if the character-string information

does not have the font information corresponding to the character string information

supported by the extracted character encoding scheme, the character-string information

output means outputs the character-string information by using another font information,

else it does not output the character string information.

Conclusion

8.   Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in

this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** See MPEP

§ 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37

CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later

than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any response to this action should be mailed to :

    Box

        Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

        Washington, DC 20231

    or faxed to:

        (703) 308-9051, (for formal communications; please mark "EXPEDITED

PROCEDURE")

Or:

(703) 872-9314 (**for technology center 2600 only**)

Hand-held delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive,

Arlington, VA , 6th floor (receptionist).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Wesner Sajous whose telephone number is (703) 308-

5857. The examiner can be reached on Mondays thru Thursdays and on alternate

Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Matthew Bella, can be reached at (703) 308-6829. The fax phone number

for this group is (703) 308-6606.

Wesner Sajous -WOS

5/23/2003

MATTHEW C. BELLA
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER-2600